


matter. Reconsideration of the rejection of amended Claim 1 is solicited.

Claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Poulin et al. It is submitted that amended Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Poulin et al. The actuator means of Claim 1 rigidly urges the locking elements and has a greater width at the second position than at said first position. In contrast, Poulin et al. employs resiliently biased protuberances to lock the plug. Poulin et al. further does not use an actuator having a variable width as defined. For these reasons, Claim 1 patentably defines over Poulin et al. and the other cited references, and a Notice of Allowance is in order.

Respectfully submitted,


Edward D. Gilhooley
Reg. No. 25,004
Attorney for Applicant

Edward D. Gilhooley
EDWARD D. GILHOOLY, LTD.
53 W. Jackson Blvd.
Suite 1516
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 294-0350

